

I do not think that he would leave these people wanting. This is not black, this is not white, this is not rich, this is not poor, this is not Republican, nor is it Democrat, it is about Americans that have been hurt and need the help of the citizenry, their fellow citizens to get back on their feet.

There are people returning to their communities and starting to do the planning in spite of the fact that they cannot get answers to the questions of how high, and when, and is anybody going to do anything at all?

There is resiliency in the people of the gulf coast. They are going to come back one way or another. It is going to be a tough bill. It is going to take time. It would take time whether the Government helped or not. But it sure would make it a whole lot better in my mind for other countries in the world to say Americans help each other.

I yield to Mr. JEFFERSON.

Mr. JEFFERSON. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. MELANCON for yielding to me. I want to say how grateful he and I are for the bipartisan approach that was made in our region just a few weeks ago when the Speaker of the House and our Democratic leader, Mr. HASTERT and Ms. PELOSI, came together and worked together in that region to address some of the issues we are talking about tonight and to bring to the attention of the American people how crucial it is that all of us pull together for this region.

As Mr. MELANCON has said, it is a very important region to our Nation. And so it is not just a matter of helping the folks of Louisiana, it is a matter of helping people across this country. Yes, our folks are strewn in 44 States around the country, but we are not talking about that sort of a national problem, we are talking about one where we actually, the country needs our region and we need our country to come to our aid so we can continue to supply these vital services to the rest of the people of our Nation.

I believe that if someone were to take a poll, Mr. MELANCON now, and ask people of this country whether they were standing with New Orleans and with our region and wanted to see us brought back, wanted to see our country helped, I think they would all say yes to that.

We just have to get the message here to the Members of Congress that people out there want to see us rebuild, want to see us recover. And if we keep this measure in front of them, the American people will see us through this. So a part of our mission here tonight is to make sure that the American people understand how deep and abiding and enduring our issues are, and to inform their Members of Congress how much we need their continuing help on a bipartisan basis to see us through this set of problems.

I think it is good for our region, it is imperative for our country, and it is the way that we ought to address these issues. We cannot go out with credi-

bility with the rest of the world and say we are going to fix their issues, their problems, their infrastructure requirements, and not say the same thing for our people here at home with any credibility.

So I thank Mr. MELANCON for what he has done to arrange this. I thank Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON-LEE for her contribution tonight, for Congresswoman LEE, and for all of our colleague who have joined us in this colloquy tonight. I appreciate the opportunity that the House has given us to bring this message to the people of our country.

Mr. MELANCON. Madam Speaker, in closing, the days immediately following the storm in Katrina, before Rita even came and devastated southwest Louisiana and eastern Texas, the only way I can get to Chalmette and St. Bernard Parish was by boat on the river. And when I got there, I met the sheriff.

And they were organizing people they were lifting off the roofs at the port facility referred to as the Chalmette Slip. And all of these people, they had lined up about 200 people putting life jackets on them, putting them on a barge to bring them across the rivers to what is known as Algiers Point in hopes that there would be buses there could take them to a good place, because nobody really knew whether the buses would come and where they would ultimately end up.

But we gave them two MREs and we put them on the barge and we sent them out to Algiers Point, one we said for supper tonight with a bottle of water, one for breakfast in the morning with a bottle of water and let's just hope that the buses will get there.

And as the sheriff and I said goodbye to these folks, the first guy that was in line looked at the sheriff and looked, and he said, Sheriff, you know me, told him his name. He says you know my brother, Joe. You know where we live. Joe drowned. Do not forget him.

The next person in line was a lady who just burst into tears and hugged the sheriff and she was excited. She thought she was going somewhere. I do not know where that lady is today. She may be in a hotel somewhere waiting to see when she can get back home.

The third person, this guy was standing there with a plastic grocery bag in his hand. And the sheriff said, I see you have got your lunch already. And he told the sheriff, this is not my lunch, this is all I have left now. My house went under 20 feet of water, at least that is about how high my roof is.

There are people that have suffered tremendously. We talked about the voting rights. I think there is enough safeguards. I believe that if America can spend millions of dollars to help Iraqis vote in this country for transitional government and elect officials in their country, then surely we can safeguard and make sure that Americans, regardless of where they are from, can vote in the elections in the commu-

nities of their choice where they reside, where they want to reside, where they want to return to.

In closing, I can only say that what we have done, while it is a good beginning, and every bit that is parceled out to the southern coastal States, we are thankful for. But this is far beyond the capacity of people or individuals to comprehend without physically seeing what is down there.

I do not care if it is Biloxi, Mississippi, New Orleans, Louisiana, Venice, Louisiana, Bayou LaBatre, Alabama, it does not matter, if you go and you see you will understand.

It is inexplicable to try and describe it. I encourage, as I did with the leadership, when the CODEL came down to Louisiana, every Member of this Congress to go down there. If you make the trip, if you see the areas that were hit, and if you do not feel differently about trying to help these Americans, then there is nothing more that I can do.

I want to thank the leadership for allowing us the time. My job I feel is to keep this issue in front of the American public, because the gulf coast area is not back up on its feet and still needs quite a bit of help. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4939, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR DEFENSE, THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR, AND HURRICANE RECOVERY, 2006

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma (during the Special Order of Mr. MELANCON) from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-391) on the resolution (H. Res. 725) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4939) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

IMMIGRATION REFORM IS NEEDED

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DRAKE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING. Madam Speaker, I would first like to start out by saying that I appreciate the opportunity to listen to the delegation, particularly the representatives from Louisiana and gentlemen from Texas and California, their remarks on how bad it is down there in the gulf coast.

Madam Speaker, I have made three trips down there myself, two of them on my own and another with a transportation CODEL. And the first one was the September 10 through September 12 when New Orleans was 70 percent underwater.

The second one was October 4 where we saw most of the coastline, all of the way through Biloxi and all of the way

to Alabama. And the third one was the middle part of January, where I went down alone and I wanted to be able to go where my instincts took me and ask questions and get a feel for what is going on down there.

And it is at least as bad as was described on the floor here tonight. It is not possible to understand the scope of the damage and the disaster that is there. I have 3,000 pictures, and can I run those through and look at them. They only bring back the memories that helped me better understand how bad it is down there still today.

And the parts of the community that still do not have water, that do not have electricity, the devastation down in Plaquemines Kerr, all of the way down to the outlet of the Mississippi was the worst, and that is the part I think that has been reported the least.

I want to say that I appreciate the tone of the people that have testified on the floor here tonight. And this is a very difficult question for this Nation. And the degree of certainty that has not been offered to the people that have their homes that have been devastated, you know I visited a home of an individual who had received his insurance check, he had paid for his house, it was a 2-year-old small brick house, and had a drive-in slab for his car.

He had stripped it out down to the 2-by-4s. He was ready to go. He had the money. He had the materials, he had the contractor lined up. But he could not get a building permit to move forward to get it done.

FEMA said we will move you in a trailer house and park it beside your house, but we cannot quite get the red tape out of the way.

The uncertainty of the Corps of Engineers, and to not know that New Orleans is going to be protected to the level that it was prior to the storm by June 1, which I think they will make it, maybe the quality of that work, some of that could be in question, I think they will make that.

But what about the next level? When you go to invest capital, and that capital might be invested for 30 years or more, than I think there needs to be a degree of certainty as to whether there is going to be protection for a category 4, 4.5 if there is one, a 5 so that people can make their only financial judgments.

We appropriated out of this Congress before Christmas funding for the Corps of Engineers to produce a category 5 study. And that is the right path to go down to some degree, but it is only going to give us one option, that is category 5. It is 24 months to produce the study.

And so 24 months of indecision, added upon these months of agony, I think, add to the pain of the people that are trying to work their way out of this. I have empathy. I have sympathy. I have initiated my own trips down there for that reason.

I have been a victim of the floods in 1993 in Iowa, and I did not realize how

much that had scarred me until I saw what happened to the people down there.

And yet the other side of this is, we do not know, we do not know where FEMA has spent the money or we do not know where they would spend the money. I do think they need to come to this Congress with an accounting of it and with a plan.

And the worst tragedy is not to have the plan to lay out in front of the people. And I would say that I think the coastline, east and west of New Orleans, will probably get themselves rebuilt with the structure that is there and the funding and the insurance that is there.

But I do not think New Orleans can come out of this without some better solution. I have pointed out that I think hard times invariably produce strong leaders. There was Winston Churchill, Rudy Giuliani. This scenario, for one reason or another, has not produced a strong leader that helps add clarity to this plan.

I am hopeful that there will be a strong leader emerge. If that can happen, it would help us all to be able to follow a path and get behind this. I do not think that there is a political struggle here. I do not think it is a partisan struggle.

My sense is that there is a sense of fiscal responsibility on the one side of this argument, and a sense of frustration that we have not been delivered the accounting or where the funding has been spent nor the plans on where it would go.

□ 2200

I know that when they came to us for the \$50 billion FEMA funding, in that was altogether 300,000 trailers, which now we have a clearer view, I think, of how much of a debacle that was; 270,000 of them were back ordered. There was \$650 million in that funding that was for mitigation of future disasters.

So some of this jumped the gun, and it has not served the people well that are suffering down there. I hope we can find a way through this. It saddens me to listen to you all tonight. This message needed to come out here before this Congress.

I just wanted to let you know that my ears heard it, and I think that there were thousands of Americans that heard it. And I hope that we can find a way to bring some solution there; and it will be a long time, I think we all know that. This is the worst natural disaster for this country ever to face in loss of lives, in loss of treasure, and the degree of difficulty in reconstructing the region, and in the planning difficulty, and how to put levees back in place, how to give people some sense of certainty.

And then on top of that the difficulty in finding reliable engineering on the settlement rates that are going on, some of them below sea level, some of them above sea level that are there. I struggled for months to get my hands

on some. I think now I have maybe all that is available in the world in my office. One rolled-up, nice-looking document.

I want to let you know that I will pay attention with you on this, and I will be working for a plan and for a solution. We may or may not agree as this process goes forward, but I wanted to express my heartfelt sympathy for the people in the gulf coast of America. I appreciate you staying on the floor to hear that message because I mean it from my heart, Mr. MELACON and all of us to you.

So however we move forward on this, hopefully the first thing and the most important thing I would think would be to get a core plan out here in front of the American people so they can start to plan. If we cannot get resources to them, at least they can move ahead on their own if they know what they can count on for protection from a flood.

We have to have a New Orleans. Thomas Jefferson saw the vision in that. If he had not bought anything except that southern part of Louisiana for the money he paid for the entire Louisiana Purchase, it would have been a good deal. Part of where I live is part of that purchase as well, but that port down there is essential to America. It must be viable again. I thank you for your words. I came to talk about another subject matter, but I appreciate the privilege to say a few words about it, and I thank you for your contribution here tonight.

Madam Speaker, I came to the floor to talk about another subject matter, and that is the subject matter that America is talking about in virtually every stop I make across the Midwest and other parts across the country, that is the subject matter of illegal immigration.

I would point out that most everyone I meet is supportive of legal immigration. I am one who is supportive of legal immigration. I have argued many times that we need to design an immigration policy that is for the enhancement of the economic, the social, and the cultural well-being of the United States of America. It needs to be a plan that is somewhat selfish, if you will: one that is designed to grow our economy; one that is designed to develop our society; one that is designed to help us continue to be the beacon of liberty for the world. That has been the charge that has fallen upon this Congress. In fact, it is the constitutional charge that the Founding Fathers wrote into our Constitution. That design and that plan have fluctuated over the years, but we have always corrected and when we have overdone things, we have always corrected.

So today we are faced with this debate, and it is a debate that is profound and it is complicated. As I listen to this debate across the Midwest especially, but around here, inside the beltway, in Washington, D.C., Madam Speaker, and around the country, I

hear two things, two things on different sides. One of them is that business cannot get along without illegal labor and that if we pull that illegal labor out of the marketplace that our economy would collapse. And the other side of that equation is that because we are all sons and daughters of immigrants, therefore we should not deny access to America to anyone because, after all, we either came here as immigrants ourselves or we descended from immigrants. That actually includes the Native Americans who, according to anthropologists, came over here about 12,000 years ago across the Bering Strait. So they were the first to arrive, but immigrants the same.

As I pose some of those questions in hearings, as I listen to the testimony, one of the questions, Madam Speaker, I posed was to the witnesses: Name a nation that was not built by immigration. And I add no one on the panel could answer that question as to any nation that had not been built by immigrants. In fact, all nations in the world have been built by immigration. There is no police in the world where there is an indigenous people that just sprouted up there and lived there and they did not leave and no one else came. We have all been the beneficiaries of fresh blood that comes in from new regions, new ethnicities with new advancements to their culture, new vigor that comes from the fresh blood of immigration. That has taken place in the United States of America in a more effective way than any place in the world.

We have done a better job of assimilation than any other place in the world. But any nation you want to look at, including Iraq, which many will say is the cradle of civilization, but there has still been immigration that has flowed back and forth there for millennia.

If you look at Europe, we know the history of the Normans and the Celts that came across that part of the world and they vied for who was going to be the rulers in that region. As the Huns came down from the north and the Romans came in from the southeast, they mixed their culture, and today we have some of that vigor. We have the legacy of that. The same here for the United States of America, only we did it under unique circumstances, Madam Speaker. We did it under these circumstances where this entire continent, in fact, the Native Americans did not view land as an ownership. And so because of that, the land had not been fought over, had not been struggled over. There had not been wars that were fought over the land itself. Yes, some of the hunting grounds, but not the lands itself.

As opposed to Europe, Madam Speaker, where for centuries the ownership of land, occupying the land, was a reason for war. So they had fought over that land and the very deep-seated grudges were rooted in that land. But as we received the beneficiaries of

Western Civilization, they came over here to the United States for their different reasons, for freedom to worship, freedom of religion, freedom of press, freedom of speech, free of enterprise, Madam Speaker, and the opportunity to invest some capital or some sweat equity or both and be able to pull themselves up by their boot straps and succeed and go clear to the top of the heap, an environment of low or no taxation and low or no regulation. But the benefit of this country was that we had an entire continent to settle, and it needed people to live on it, Madam Speaker.

So the new circumstance turned out to be good people, hardworking, God-fearing, aggressive people to settle this land, could homestead much of this land. And the legacy of the grudge, the blood that was on the land they left did not get imprinted here on the land in the United States of America. So we were able to under that kind of environment, where there were not grudge matches over the ownership of the land, bring people from different walks of life, from different nationalities, different ethnicities, different languages, different religions and bring them together on this land called America where they assimilated with each other on a common value system, began to understand and learn a common history that bound them together. They learned a common language called English that tied them together. They had a religion that was predominantly Christianity. They had Judeo-Christian values that bound them together and they had a sense of destiny. They had a clarion call for manifest destiny. And they settled this continent from the Atlantic to the Pacific in a very, very short period of time.

But that was a legacy of the circumstances of history, the hand of providence, the values that they brought with them, Madam Speaker, unique in the world. And so we have this unique privilege and this unique opportunity in the United States of America. We have a sacred covenant with our Founding Fathers that we must preserve and protect and defend. We have an obligation to look down-range, to look beyond the horizon and ask questions of all of us.

What has America been? What is America today? And what is America to be tomorrow, next year, next decade, next generation, next half a century, next century?

Madam Speaker, I do not hear a lot of that discussion in this immigration discussion that we have. I hear short-term discussions that have to do with I need to have these people come in here, the illegals, because we count them in the census and therefore we apportion congressional districts. They have a representation in Congress, and they do, Madam Speaker. In fact, there will be nine to 11 congressional seats in America that exist because the illegals that live in that district are counted right the same as an American citizen.

And at least two of those seats in a State that I can think of, it only takes 30,000 votes to win a seat in Congress.

My district, the Fifth District of Iowa, takes 120,000 votes to win a seat in Congress because we have very few illegals in my district. So the people who come to the polls are about 240,000 strong out of 600,000 people altogether. That would be the registered voters. But in a couple of seats out west, there are only 60,000 registered voters to come to the polls because the rest of them are either not registered or they are here in the United States illegally and they cannot vote.

So 30,000 votes wins the seat in Congress that has the same voice, the same vote that my 120,000 people that come to the polls to vote have. That is wrong, Madam Speaker. The people who are citizens of the United States deserve representation here. They do not deserve to have their representation diluted by counting people who came into this country illegally. But that is the political power of illegal immigration that is aligned mostly with the left.

So they have a powerful political motive to support massive supplies of illegals to come into this country in the first place because they guarantee congressional seats in Congress, nine, 10 or 11 of them, depending on whose study you want to follow.

In the second place because they believe that if they keep the pressure up there will be a path to citizenship so that those people do get to vote. It changes the political dynamic in America. That is the urge on the left. That is their motivation to not stand by the rule of law, to not defend our borders, to not enforce domestically the violation of immigration laws, Madam Speaker.

On the other side of this equation are the companies that are profiting from illegal labor. Now, they will argue and they have argued relentlessly and vociferously that we cannot be deporting 11 million illegals. I would argue that, yes, I think we could if we had the will to do so if we could find the means and the way to do so. I do not suggest that we do that, but I reject the idea that we could not do that.

I would argue that they came here on their own. They could go back on their own. And we need to get people to go back to their home country, get in the line to come into the United States legally, not illegally.

To give an example of what happens when you reward people for breaking the law, I recall a protestor that had signs out at an event that I attended some months ago, and those signs said, "I was an illegal immigrant. Now I am a United States citizen. Steve King is a" pick your adjective that you might want to describe me as, Madam Speaker. But it struck me that this individual was proud that he had come into the country as an illegal alien, but he was given amnesty in 1986 in one of the two times that my beloved President Ronald Reagan let me down.

So the reward for breaking the laws of the United States was United States citizenship. And then he has contempt for the law and argues that we ought not enforce our immigration laws today. He was a beneficiary of not enforcing them in 1986. Now he is a United States citizen. Now he is exercising his rights of citizenship to protest the idea that I would stand up to defend the rule of law. Of course he has contempt for the rule of law. The rule of law did not restrain him from breaking it to come into the United States. And he was rewarded by citizenship for breaking the laws of the United States.

One of the foundations, one of the basic tenets of being an American, our American values, is respect for the rule of law, Madam Speaker. And if we bring in millions of people who have contempt for the rule of law, we will find ourselves devolved into a downward spiral of the kind of corruption that we see south of the border. There is contempt of the rule of law there. You have to pay off the police force. You cannot protect the rights of property. There is a reason that their economy has not grown like our economy has grown. And that reason is many of the things that we know: the rule of law; respect for the law; a kind of a culture that polices itself.

When we wonder whether it is actually the Mexican military, Madam Speaker, or whether it is paramilitary dressed like the Mexican military or active duty Mexican military who are hired out to the drug cartels that are escorting convoys of drugs across the Rio Grande into the United States, it does not matter a lot to me. A country that can have that kind of thing going on has contempt for the rule of law, their own laws, and absolutely has a policy that runs directly against the laws of the United States of America.

Fifty-eight percent of Mexicans believe they have a right to come to the United States, 58 percent. How can that be in a nation that hears this media? Our television blasts down in there. Our radio blasts down in there. Don't they hear this message continuously that Congress is now fed up, that we passed immigration laws?

□ 2215

I guarantee you, Madam Speaker, they do because somewhere between 25,000 and 40,000 of them were here in this city last week protesting the fact that we want to enforce our borders.

Now, think of this. The Nation State, United States of America, Nation State, one of many, one of several hundred Nation States in the world, if there was ever an institution that demonstrated its resilience and its success over the last century, the 20th century, it is a Nation State, and a Nation cannot be Nation unless it has borders. You cannot declare there be borders unless you enforce them.

The reason we have borders is, one, for national security, national security, so foreign armies do not come in,

so that contraband does not come in like illegal drugs, guns, weapons, weapons of mass destruction. It could be chemical weapons. It could be biological or nuclear. It could be a dirty nuclear device. A Nation has to have borders and enforce their borders to protect their national security, for one thing.

To control the flow of commerce for another so that our commercial treaties that we have from one Nation to another are honored and respected and any duties that might be owed at the border get paid, going both ways, another reason to have a border. You have to define that location with a bright line, Madam Speaker, because a border defines the line distinctions between the law of two Nations. We have a law that says you do not come into the United States in violation of our law. You have to have lawful presence to be here, but the contempt that is demonstrated on our southern border encourages more than 4 million to come across the border in a single year.

In the last reporting year, 1,159,000 illegals were stopped by the border patrol in the southern border. That is 1,159,000. Of those 1,159,000, there were probably another 3 million that made it in that did not get stopped, but of 1,159,000, only 1,640 were adjudicated for deportation. That is not a very good percentage, and the rest were released on, one might say, their own recognition, but I would say they are released on their promise to return to their home country, I promise I will go to my home country, please let me go, Mr. Border Patrol, and they are released.

About 155,000 of them were other than Mexicans, OTMs, and these were those that we did not have the right kind of a treaty arrangement to be able to deport them to their home country. So now we have a lot of Congress that is upset about that. I cannot draw a distinction between whether they were other than Mexicans or whether they were Mexicans. They all fit into the same category to me. They broke the law to come into the United States. We need to enforce the law.

Why can we not do immediate deportation? Why can we not we just issue the order that says you came into the country illegally, we will take you down to the turnstile and you go back where you came from; if you come back here again, we have got your fingerprints now; we will lock you up; now then we will send you back. That is a simple solution.

But we need to put a fence along our southern border, Madam Speaker, and I called for that fence on August 22. We passed legislation that would build a fence here 3 months, 3 weeks and 3 days, 114 days, later and that would be 700 miles of the 2,000. I supported that. I thought Duncan Hunter did good work on it. He wrote up a very good plan to build a reasonable fence. I would connect it the whole way, and even with a 10-foot chain link fence,

with wire on top, it would be about \$680 million to build it the whole way.

I would want to delineate and define and identify our border, and I would hang signs on the south side of them in Spanish that say, you cannot come here through this fence. You need to go sign up, go sign up and then wait your turn, and you can come to the United States if there is room for you in the amount of legal immigration that we are going to allow.

We cannot guarantee that everybody that wants to come to America can come here. In fact, if we opened up our border, Madam Speaker, and allowed everyone to come here that wants to come here, I would imagine there would be somewhere around 6 billion in the United States. Sooner or later, if we ended up 3 or 4 billion, maybe by that point it would be so crowded that folks would decide they do not want to.

But at what point does it sink the lifeboat called the United States of America? At what point when we are taking people on and bringing them in and telling ourselves that we are the relief valve for poverty in the world and we are doing good things for these million or 2 million or 3 or 4 million people that come in here every year, and that makes our heart feel good, but while that is going on, there are another 10 or 12 million that are born, that are not going to have that opportunity to come here. There are another 4.6 billion people on the planet that have a lower standard of living than the average citizen in Mexico.

So it is not possible for us to alleviate poverty by opening up our borders. Maybe we can alleviate any kind of guilt that is there. Madam Speaker, I feel none. It is a great blessing to be born in the United States. It is a tremendous privilege to be able to come here as a lawful resident and be able to earn citizenship that is here. I see that from people who are Americans by choice, and the depth of their patriotism and their commitment to this country is strong. I appreciate that and they bring their talents with them, and it adds to the vitality and they love freedom. Many of them love freedom as much, or more, than native born Americans do because they have known something other than that freedom.

But we cannot be the relief valve for the poverty in the world. We can export our values, but if we think we are going down take on all the poor people in the world: Bring me your tired, your poor, or your hungry, the wretched refuse of your teaming shores, that cannot go on because this lifeboat will sink. And then where do people migrate to then?

So I would ask as you are involved in this debate, and as Americans across the world are, I would ask them to pose the question, when somebody steps up and says I think we ought to have open borders and a guest worker plan and a temporary worker plan, I would ask them this question: Is there such a thing as too much immigration? Simple, number one, easy question. If they

will not be willing to answer, because they know that if they answer the question the way they would like to answer it, which is, no, there is not too much, then they have to answer the question if 6 billion Americans are too many. When you ask that question you say, well, that is a few too many, or about 5 billion or 4 billion or 3 billion, or 2 billion, that is all too many.

They have to begin to settle on an answer of what should the population of the United States be. Is there such a thing as too much immigration? If so, how much? Why would there be too many people living in the United States? If it came to 1 billion people here like there are in China and India and the answer to that is that, yes, we could sustain that kind of population. It would be crowded, packed and put pressure on our infrastructure. We would not have enough roads, schools and hospitals. Our parks would be packed in full, and we would have to shut some of them down. We would not have enough clean water. We would have trouble handling the sewer. We could make those adjustments if we had the people, but there is not a reason to open the doors to take on that load and change the character of America that dramatically.

So there is such a thing, Madam Speaker, as too much immigration, and too much immigration from a single country changes the culture and character of America.

I am not here to say whether that is good or bad, but I am here to suggest, Madam Speaker, that we need to have a national debate on that. We need to have a national debate to discuss what is the character of America, what has made us strong, where do we derive our strength.

I do not hear that discussion here in this Congress. I do not hear it around the hallways of the offices that are around here, and I do not hear it a lot back in Iowa either, but I would submit that the strength of America comes from three main pillars.

Those three main pillars are free enterprise capitalism. We have had the freedom and the opportunity and the structure and the rule of law to let us invest our dollars in our sweat equity to do the best we can to earn our way through this life. If you rise to the top of the heap and you are worth \$50 billion and you are Bill Gates, hurray for you. America cheers that kind of success because we know when someone makes it to the top of the ladder, they have also helped many others up to the top of the ladder with them, and that kind of success spills out amongst us all. A rising tide lifts all boats. The tide of Bill Gates and Microsoft and \$50 billion and an individual's wealth has risen all boats and we all live better because of that and that creativity is awarded here in the United States because we have a rule of law. We have free enterprise capitalism. So the first pillar is free enterprise capitalism.

The second pillar of the strength of America's economy is Western civiliza-

tion. We could go into a discussion about the struggle of the west versus the east right now, and Western civilization being challenged by radicalism, but I think, for the time being, I will take us to the benefits of Western civilization, Madam Speaker. I will suggest that the origins of Western civilization are rooted in the Greek, the Greek thought, 2000, 3000 years before the time of Christ when they sat around and took great pride in being able to reason, to be rational, to be able to set up a theorem and be able to track that and be able to prove to the level of the science that they had things that they could believe in that were factual. Once they could establish those facts, they could move on to other facts that were based on real truth.

Now, we are in this age where there is an argument that there is no such thing as truth, but I will argue that there are many things that are true, and it is the math and sciences, the physics, the chemistry, the geometry. Physics, chemistry and geometry, math, those sciences, those things, exact sciences, the things that you could count upon and use to calculate the engineering design to build a bridge over a river, for example, that is some of the foundations that grew from Western civilization.

We saw the Romans develop their engineering in a magnificent way, and they were part of Western civilization, and they demonstrated how you could take science and reason and be able to do wonderful engineering designs, many of which exists to this day in Rome. That is, the Greeks, in particular, and the Romans successes are the foundation of the Western civilization, and as that thought, that age of reason flowed its way up through Europe and found itself in the age of enlightenment in France, in particular, in the late 1600s and in the 1700s, that age of enlightenment that brought forth the industrial revolution, those values of Western civilization, the beginnings of the industrial revolution found their way to the new world, found their way to the North American continent.

Where? We had free enterprise capitalism now married up with an industrial revolution that was the Western civilization, the success of Greek thought, Roman thought, age of enlightenment in Western Europe that came over here and tied up together with this almost free enterprise opportunity where there was almost no taxation and no regulation, but there was a protection of the rule of law. There was a return on capital. The return on that capital, coupled with the science and the technology, brought about this robust economy here in the United States.

That robust economy would, I think, have turned this Nation into a voracious, imperialistic Nation that would have been seeking to conquer the world and that conquest and occupation of

the world would have been the natural result of that appetite, of almost perfect environment for free enterprise and almost perfect receptacle for Western civilization, those two pillars, free enterprise, Western civilization.

But the third pillar came along to mitigate this, tie this together and give it a moral foundation. That is our Judeo-Christian values. Those are the values that are part of our culture, that tell this Nation of Americans that you have a duty that goes beyond yourself. We have a duty to the world, we have a duty to posterity and duty to God to establish a moral foundation. That moral foundation has been our restraint, our restraint that causes us to help other people up the ladder and reach out and promote this freedom and this liberty so that the rest of the world will have that opportunity to benefit from the technology, the industrial revolution, the free enterprise capitalism, the descendants of and now the leaders of Western civilization.

But it was our Judeo-Christian values that tempered that aggressive appetite and made us a moral Nation. That is the core that has made America great. That is a debate that we have to have and the values that we need to preserve, and if we will preserve those values and if we can infuse those values into people that come here to take advantage of these opportunities, and if we are knowledgeable about what has made this Nation great and if we are humble about this blessing that we have and if we take this responsibility seriously, so that we know that when new people come here their opportunity for assimilation becomes also a way for them to be incorporated into these American values, these values that I have articulated of free enterprise capitalism, Western civilization, Judeo-Christian values, all tied together, that drive us toward a destiny to be the leader of the world, not just the leader of the free world.

We used to say United States of America is the leader of the free world. No, we are the leader of the world. Our Nation is the world's only future power. Being the world's only future power is an awesome responsibility, Madam Speaker, but also shaping this Nation is an awesome responsibility.

So the question becomes, is there such a thing as too much immigration? Yes. If so, why? It overburdens us, as I said, our infrastructure, the highways, our sewers, our roads, but also, it changes the shape and the character and the culture of America. We should be always nurturing this character and culture to be pro-free enterprise, pro-Western civilization, pro-Judeo-Christian values, and you might notice, Madam Speaker, none of those values I have given necessarily run contrary to the largest population that comes into the country both legally and illegally, but we need to articulate this and bring people under our wing so they can be assimilated as Americans.

Then to ask the question of those who are for open borders, what will

America look like in 10 years, 25 years, 50 years, 100 years?

□ 2230

What is their vision for America? What do they believe are the circumstances and the consequences of essentially unlimited immigration? And their answer will be: This Nation can't get along without the immigrants because, after all, it was built on immigrants. And we can't get along without the labor that is there. Business will collapse.

Madam Speaker, I would submit business won't collapse. Four percent of our labor force is illegal labor. They do 2.2 percent of the work. They turn out 2.2 percent of the work; 4.0 percent of the labor force. And they earn about \$75 or \$76 billion in wages, and they send between \$20 billion and \$30 billion of those wages back south of the border to their home countries.

Now, that puts a burden on our health care, our education services, and our welfare services. And you would argue, no, they do not access welfare if they are not here legally. True. But their children do. So it comes out to be, for the average illegal family, about \$2,700 that an illegal family is a burden on the taxpayers. Most of that is to provide education and health care and those things.

If they were legalized in a guest worker or temporary worker plan, then that burden on the taxpayer would go up because they would utilize those services more. The calculation by the Pew Foundation is about \$7,700 per family, if my memory serves me correctly. So it would be not quite triple the cost of having an illegal family here to legalize them.

But it is not a net gain to our economy by that measure. In fact, it is a burden on the taxpayer, Madam Speaker. And so I would go further and submit that of the 11 million, and now perhaps 12 million people, it has been charted that the workforce that exists is 6.3 million, some will say 6.5 million of the 11 million, and that group, and I will use the 6.3 million, is the workforce. That is the workforce that would need to be replaced if they were all doing essential work.

I would submit that if they are mowing lawns, if they are trimming trees, if they are doing servant work around houses, people that might be able to mow their own lawn, trim their own trees, maybe make their own bed or do their own vacuuming, that that is not essential work. Some of that is not essential. Some is. But for the sake of argument, let us just say there are 6.3 million people here illegally working doing essential work. And if they all went home over a period of time, it wouldn't happen all at once but over a period of time, then maybe we would need to replace that workforce.

How might we do that, Madam Speaker? I would submit that one of the ways we could do that would be to go into the unemployment rolls. On

any day there are 7.5 million unemployed, and we are paying them not to work. There are another 5.2 million out there that have exhausted their unemployment benefits that will answer the polling and the survey saying I am looking for work. I want a job. So 7.5 million, plus 5.2 million. That is 12.7.

In addition to that, between the ages of 16 and 19, the teenagers, there are 9.3 million teenagers that are not in the workforce. Not even part-time. Presumably some of them would like to go to work and earn some money for their college education or perhaps some spending money or to pay for their car, even on a part-time basis. So there are 9.3 million of those. And between the ages of 65 and 69, people that are in retirement age, and some of them presumably in pretty good health, as our health is nowadays at that age, there are 4.5 million people in that age group.

Now, I add up a little more, I started looking, and this is all from the U.S. Department of Labor statistics that are available on their Web page, but between the ages of 20 and 64, and including those ages, there are 51 million people that are not in the workforce. We only have a workforce in America of 140 million people, and we have about 283 million by our census from the year 2000. That has grown some, but 140 million people working out of at least 280 million. So perhaps less than half of America is actually working today, and the other half could, some of them, presumably, could go to work.

But of the lists that I have given, the unemployed, those looking for work, those 16 to 19 years old, those between the ages of 65 and 69, and those between the ages over 20 and 64 that are not in the workforce, there are 51 million of them between the ages of 20 and 64 not in the workforce. They might be retired, independently wealthy, they might be working for cash, or they could be drug dealers, Madam Speaker. They could be doing anything, but they are not in the workforce. So I add these people up to find out how big of a pool there is to hire from. And that pool totals up today, by those statistics, at 77.5 million people in America that would be a pool that one could potentially hire from to go harvest the onions or the grapes or fix the roof or vacuum the floors or make the bed or cut the grass or trim the trees or pull the weeds or whatever the situation may call for. Whatever job it is that some say Americans won't do.

We would only have to hire from those Americans one out of 12 of those sitting around idle and put them to work to replace those who are here illegally. One out of twelve. Is that too much of a burden on America for the rule of law, to hire one out of 12 of the idle among us, to put them to work?

But, I forgot, Madam Speaker, there is work out here that Americans won't do. I remember a particular high-profile leader made a statement here a couple of months ago that was, if it is

105 degrees in Dallas and you need a roof fixed, you aren't going to find an American to do that job. So I went back to my staff and I asked them, What would be the dirtiest, most difficult, most dangerous job that there is to do anywhere in the world?

We surveyed around through the jobs and the different countries and came to the conclusion that rooting the terrorists out of the hovels in Fallujah would be the dirtiest, most difficult, the most dangerous, and the hottest job there is anywhere in the world. With 130 degrees, you put on a flak jacket, go in there and risk your life to root the terrorists out of Fallujah. Well, the lowest ranking marine would be collecting about \$8.09 an hour. That is if he was there on a 40-hour week. And you can bet he is turning in more than 40 hours in that combat environment, Madam Speaker. But \$8.09 an hour to do that kind of work.

And they are proud of their work. And they deserve every accolade we can give them and all the honor from here in this Congress and from the American people. They have demonstrated that they will do that work for that kind of pay plus the honor that comes with the sacrifice. And the memories that we will have and the memories that their families will have and the appreciation and the gratitude this country will have cannot be measured in dollars. And they would be the first to tell you that. But it gives you an example of the kind of work that is being done out there for low pay.

I have spent my life in the construction business, and I have hired all kinds of people to do all kinds of work. I never hired anybody to do work I would not do. In fact, I never found work I would not do. If it needed doing, I would jump in there and do it alongside the people I hired. But I could find people to do necessary work, and sometimes I had to pay them an adequate rate for that necessary work.

But paying someone \$6 or \$7 an hour to harvest a crop and arguing that that is a good going rate, or \$8 or \$9 an hour and saying I am paying \$8.50 an hour for people to harvest my onions, but I can't get anybody to come do it for that kind of money. Well, okay, that doesn't mean there isn't available labor. It means the going rate is higher than that.

I spent some time working on the pipeline when I was a young man, when I was about 19 years old. They would pull in on a job, might be Kansas, in fact, this one was, and they would start hiring people and the wage would go. And it paid a good wage and it paid expenses and mileage. And we had people come from all over the country with their welding rigs and their campers. And in no time at all, there would be a little town that would build up out there on the prairie, and it would be right there by what we called the bone yard, where we dispatched our trucks and our equipment and we went out and began building that pipeline across the State of Kansas.

They built a little city there because there was enough money to attract workers from all over America. They brought their equipment and they brought their trailers and they came and set up a campsite and went to work. And that is not the only place that that has happened. That is just an example that I happen to live by. And the reason we came from places like Iowa and Utah to places like Kansas was because the pay was good. For me it was \$2.10 an hour, so that was enough to get me all the way down to Kansas to do that work at that time.

□ 2240

Today it is a different wage scale, but the incentive is the same. I have heard arguments that our onion and blueberry industries would collapse, and nobody would be there to harvest the grapes or the cucumbers or the zucchini. I would not lament if the zucchini were never harvested. However, unlike the first President Bush, I do like broccoli.

However, the markets that are there have been established by supply and demand, and the labor is established by supply and demand. The argument that there is not labor there to do the work, I would submit that there are many businesses that are raising specialty crops that have established their business on the premise of hiring illegal labor to do the work. When it became more difficult for illegal labor to get there to do the work, now they come to the government and say, legalize them.

They have become addicted to illegal labor, the addiction of the heroin of illegal labor, and now they want the methadone of the legalization of a guest worker or temporary worker plan. There is no such thing as a temporary worker plan in the history of the world. No successful plan, I would submit. I would say that I can think of one temporary worker plan, and that was when Moses led the Israelites out of Egypt. That is an example of a failed temporary worker plan. I find no example of a successful temporary worker plan.

I sat in on hearings and I listened to a witness testify that their agriculture processing operation was near the border and they had a weekly turnover of 9 percent of their employee workforce which was a substantial size workforce. So it was difficult to recruit new people because they had trouble coming across the border to go to work every day, sometimes for the week I imagine. And it was the fault of Uncle Sam because we have tightened up our border enforcement, which I am somewhat surprised to hear.

I would submit the business plan was based on an illegal premise, the plan of setting up a business near the border so it would be easily accessible by illegal workers, to bring people in because they would work cheaper and you could send them back to their home country and not have to worry about, and I do not know in this particular case, but

from a general perspective one could take this assumption, and not have to worry about health insurance, workers comp, litigation, retirement benefits, the kind of things that are the burdens attached to any employer here in the United States who hires legal people.

There is a benefit to hiring illegals. They work cheaper. You can hire them when you need them, send them away when you don't need them. They do not have a contingent liability that goes with them. They are not filing a lawsuit against you.

One of the things they do also is they claim a maximum number of dependents. At say \$10 an hour, to pick a round number, claiming the maximum number of dependents, there would be no withholding for Federal income tax. And in Iowa, there would be no State income tax withholding, especially for the States that do have income tax. An illegal would forfeit their payroll tax, the 7.65 portion for Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid.

When that is said and done, compared to an American citizen, the illegal would take \$1.54 more an hour than your legal American citizen. How long is an American citizen going to put up with that, taking home less pay, knowing that the person next to them is not paying taxes except for the mandatory withholding of the 7.65 percent that goes to Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid.

So I asked the American people: What do you think of this? What would the real survey results be, and I sent out a mailing of 10,000 questionnaires to the Fifth Congressional District of Iowa, randomly selected households from different areas of the 32 counties that I represent. I asked a series of 20 some questions on immigration. The most operative question, the most instructive question asked on a scale of 1 to 10, with 10 being the most intensive, how intensively do you agree with this statement: We should eliminate all illegal immigration and reduce legal immigration.

Now, I am not calling for reducing legal, I would freeze it where it is, but that was the question. On a scale of 1 to 10, 82 percent wrote down 10. Some of them I think held their pen like a dagger when they wrote their numbers and comments on the side. They were intense.

Madam Speaker, 82 percent said eliminate illegal, reduce legal, and they were emphatic. If you added up to the 6s, 7s, 8s and 9s to the 10s, 97 percent said eliminate illegal immigration and reduce legal. That is the America that respects the rule of law and knows that if we do not have rule of law, control of our border, if Congress does not have the will to enforce these laws, how can they advocate that there is going to be something like a guest worker or temporary worker program. They cannot legitimately do that. The American people know better. They know this administration has not demonstrated a will to enforce the laws of the United States of America.

And if we put more laws on the books, as we have sought to do here on the floor of Congress and sent over to the Senate, if those laws are signed into law by the President, that does not mean that a single one of them will be enforced by this administration. In fact, in the last 2 years, I cannot count you a half dozen businesses that have been sanctioned for hiring illegals. Yet I can point to a business that had 34,000 no-match Social Security numbers, and the withholding of those went into the suspended earnings file. Over 34,000 for a single company, they got the letters from the Social Security Administration. They know they are hiring illegals as a matter of practice.

I have put together a piece of legislation that seeks to remedy this. It is called the New IDEA bill. New, there are not hardly any new ideas in any legislative process, and this Congress is no different, but I believe this is a new idea. It is called the New Illegal Deduction Elimination Act.

I looked around and tried to identify what government agency is doing their job, what government agency is enforcing, what agency has the will to enforce the laws that they are charged to enforce and protect and to bring penalty and interest and do their collection. We know who that is, it is the Internal Revenue Service, not the IRS, not the current ICE, but the Internal Revenue Service.

So I thought how can I use the IRS to enforce immigration law. I drafted up some legislation and it does this: New IDEA, Illegal Deduction Elimination Act, removes the Federal deductibility for wages and benefits that are paid to illegals. It allows for an employer to go on the basic pilot program on the Internet, instant check I call it, entered the Social Security number and some other data. That search mechanism goes out to the database of the Department of Homeland Security, NCIC, and comes back and it will tell you if that identifies, the information entered identifies someone who is legal to work in the United States.

If an employer uses the instant check program, they get a safe harbor protection from the New IDEA. But if they do not use instant check or if they use it and ignore the results, they know or should have known they are hiring an illegal, and the IRS, in the course of their normal audits, would come in and remove that deductibility.

So presumably, let us go back to the \$10 an hour employee. That \$10 an hour employee would have been a \$10 deduction for the employer from their income side. It would go over to the schedule C side of their income tax. But when the IRS looked at that and determined the \$10 that you paid went to an illegal, the company knew or should have known it was an illegal, they remove that from the schedule C and it goes back over into the gross receipts and presumably becomes profit.

If this is a company, corporate income tax perhaps in the 34 percent

bracket, then their elimination of that \$10 deduction from their income becomes income and the interest and the penalty and the tax on that accrues to about \$6 an hour. So your \$10-an-hour employee when the IRS is done with their audit becomes about a \$16-an-hour employee. That makes it a circumstance by which a legal American can perhaps compete. A \$16-an-hour illegal does not look quite so good any more compared to the \$12 an hour legal.

Those kinds of rational decisions will be made by the millions across this country when we pass New IDEA, when the President signs New IDEA into law. It will dry up the jobs magnet. We need to shut down this jobs magnet because that is what is attracting the illegals into America. Shut off the jobs magnet, eliminate birthright citizenship, and seal up the border. If we could do those three things, what we would see happening is fewer people would be coming into the United States. Two of the biggest reasons to come here would be gone: Birthright citizenship and jobs. The jobs dry up.

□ 2250

And then the human traffic that is 4 million strong; this human haystack that pours across our border begins traveling back in the other direction and starts to head back south again. That will happen by the millions. I don't think it empties out 11 or 12 million. In fact, I think there are perhaps 20 or more million in this country that are illegal. But I think it maybe takes 30 to 40 percent of those that will go back south again. I know that there are quite a few that were working off the books that aren't even being deducted. They are working cheap enough that the employer decides, I am not going to do the book work on them; it is too much trouble. I am just simply going to hand them cash and pay them off.

But I also know that there are perhaps 50 percent or more that are on the books that are sending in these no-match Social Security numbers that go in the earning suspense file like the 34,000 for the single company.

We pass New IDEA, that changes some of that. That sends the traffic back to the south, shuts off the jobs magnet in many of these companies; and American citizens have a chance to go to work again, people that are lawfully present here in the United States, the green cardholders. Those that are trying to earn their citizenship the right way have an opportunity.

And what do we say, Madam Speaker, to the young people in America that decide they don't want to go to college and become a doctor or a lawyer or a scientist or somebody that is an MBA from Harvard? What do we say to those people that say, I have had 13 years of school, kindergarten, K-12. I have had it. I want to go to work. I want to work with my hands. I want to develop my skills. I want to start earning a pay-

check and bring it home, and I want to do something different with my life. This is the pace that I want. Those people have all been cut out of this.

I got a letter from a lady the other day. She and her husband had been involved in the construction business all their lives. They have been pushed out now. There is no opportunity for them. They are essentially jobless because illegal labor has undercut their wages to the point where they can't get a job anymore.

One Easter I was in a motel visiting my in-laws, and I happened to have a conversation there in between mass with a couple of people that were of Mexican descent. They were U.S. citizens. They happened to be working up in Nebraska. I said, Why are you here? And it is Easter and you are away from your families. And they said, well, we can't go to work down on the southern border because there are so many illegals down there that you can hire four of them for every one of us, so we have to come here to Nebraska. And one of them was going to the Philippines the next week. But they were traveling and sending their money back to their families in southern Texas because the proliferation of illegal labor shut them out of the job market in their own neighborhood, Madam Speaker. This goes on, over and over again.

But I beseech the United States Senate to cease discussion, deliberation, bringing language out of the Judiciary Committee that provides for guest worker-temporary worker. It is a flawed plan. There has never been a successful guest worker-temporary worker plan ever in the history of the world. The arrogance or the idea that you could configure one in committee and sit back and draw one up because you know what's best for America, without a model. And then what would happen is that comes over here from the Senate after you water down the enforcement that we sent over there, and you send us your temporary worker plan, which America knows can't work, and it comes to the floor of this Congress and for political reasons, nearly every one on that side of the aisle will vote for it, Madam Speaker.

And for whatever reasons, misguided reasons, I think, political reasons, because business wants cheap labor, some of the people on this side of the aisle will vote for it too and this will go, if it goes to the President, he will sign a temporary worker plan. It will be an amnesty plan, Madam Speaker. I have seen nothing that anyone has drafted up that is anything but an amnesty plan.

The American people know amnesty. They will understand amnesty, and they will let out a hue and cry and a scream that will be heard for generations if we fail them now; if we fail to provide enforcement at our border to build a fence, to seal that border and send a message that this is a sovereign line between two countries; if we fail to

sanction employers; if we fail to pass New IDEA; if we fail to put policies in place that cause people to migrate back to their home countries.

But if we can succeed in enforcement, we can also promote American values, Madam Speaker. In those countries that need help and the people who are coming here are the solutions for the countries that they are leaving. If they would go back to their home countries and build their countries and enforce the changes that are necessary for the reforms, the world is a better place. Their country is more prosperous, their children will have opportunities. And that is the legacy that can echo around the world. It can't succeed under guest worker-temporary worker.

We have an obligation and a duty to our Founding Fathers, to our constituents, to Americans, to God to preserve and protect this great country and to shape an immigration policy that is designed to enhance the economic, the social, and the cultural well-being of the United States of America.

BLUE DOG COALITION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DRAKE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ROSS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROSS. Madam Speaker, on behalf of the 37-member strong fiscally conservative Blue Dog Coalition, a group of 37 fiscally conservative Democrats that have a common goal, and that is to restore some common sense and fiscal discipline to our Nation's government, and on behalf of the Blue Dog Coalition, I rise this evening as I do every Tuesday evening to discuss the debt, the deficit, the budget and accountability within our government because I believe, as Members of Congress, Members of this body, we were sent here by the American people to be good stewards of our tax dollars.

I grew up at Midway United Methodist Church just outside of Prescott, in Hope, Arkansas. Heard a lot of sermons growing up about what it meant to be a good steward. And what I learned growing up at Midway Methodist Church about stewardship I believe also applies to being good stewards of our tax dollars.

And, Madam Speaker, I rise this evening because today the U.S. national debt is \$8,270,385,415,129 and some change. Again, that is a lot of numbers, and sometimes I get them a little confused. \$8,270,385,415,129. For every man and woman and child in America, including those being born right now, each individual in America's share, every man, woman and child's share of the national debt, comes to some \$27,000 and some change.

It is hard to believe now, but from 1998 through 2001, we had a balanced budget in this Nation. And yet for the last 6 years, this administration and this Republican Congress have given us the largest budget deficit ever, ever in